REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 have been rejected. Claims 1, 12, and 20 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. The specification was amended to correlate with the figures.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 as unpatentable over Bruder (U.S. Patent 4,559,616). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks made herein.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a magnetic random access memory circuit, comprising: a sensor for producing a sensor signal representing a sensed external condition that affects performance of the magnetic memory; and a compensation circuit for compensating for the sensed external condition; wherein the compensation circuit is configured to adjust the write current for word and bit lines of the magnetic memory by an amount required to substantially compensate for the effect of the sensed external condition on the write current required to record information. The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over United States Patent No. 4,559,616 (the Bruder Patent). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Bruder Patent relates to a bubble memory module. It does not relate to Magnetic RAM or MRAM, as claimed. Further the Office Action contends that elements 4 and 5 of Fig. 1 of Bruder are sensors as claimed. Applicant disagrees. Elements 4 and 5 do not produce a "sensor signal representing a sensed external condition that affects performance of the magnetic memory" as claimed.

Claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended to further require adjusting the write current for word and bit lines of the magnetic memory by an amount required to substantially compensate for the effect of the sensed external condition on the write current required to reliably write data. This is a limitation that does not apply to bubble memories as taught by Bruder.

A claimed invention is unpatentable for obviousness if the differences between it and the prior art "are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art." 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (1994); Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 14, 148 USPQ 459, 465 (1966). Obviousness is a legal question based on underlying factual determinations including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art, including what that prior art teaches explicitly and inherently; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (4) objective evidence of nonobviousness. Graham, 383 U.S. at 17-18, 148 USPQ at 467; In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 998, 50 USPQ 1614, 1616 (Fed. Cir. 1999); In re Napier, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 USPQ2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (stating that the inherent teachings of a prior art reference is a question of fact). The Office Action does not provide any evidence of a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Bruder to produce the invention as claimed. In fact, Bruder would not teach, motivate, or suggest to those skilled in the art to modify the invention of Bruder to apply to MRAMs. The Bruder patent is concerned with the problem of correcting the magnetic bias field for variations in the temperature of the bubble memory chip. See col. 2, lines 45-55. By contrast, the problem solved by Applicants' invention is the operation within a tight window of switching fields in order reliably to write data. See paragraph 5 of the application. Claims 3-11 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over Bruder for the foregoing reasons. Claims 13 and 15-19 are either directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 12 and are thus patentable for the foregoing reasons.

Applicants appreciate the finding of allowability of claims 21-24 and further assert their patentability for the foregoing reasons. Therefore, the claimed invention would not have been obvious and Applicants therefore respectfully request that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: June 8, 2005

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
Holland & Knight LLP
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 3000
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 789-7773 (voice)
(305) 789-7799 (fax)

Certificate of First-Class Mail Mailing

I hereby certify that this Amendment and Response to Office Action, and any documents referred to as attached therein are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail on this date, June 8, 2005, to the Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Michael J. Buchenhorner

Date: June 8, 2005

2947246_v1